Grocery Product Pricing and Australian Supermarket Consumers: Gender Differences in Perceived Importance Levels

Gary Mortimer*
Clinton S. Weeks

Dr Gary Mortimer* (Corresponding Author)
QUT Business School
Queensland University of Technology
2 George Street
PO Box 2434
Brisbane, Queensland, 4001
Australia
Email: gary.mortimer@qut.edu.au

Dr Clinton S. Weeks
QUT Business School
Queensland University of Technology
2 George Street
PO Box 2434
Brisbane, Queensland, 4001
Australia
Email: clinton.weeks@qut.edu.au

Version Date: 12th May *2011*

Abstract

Grocery shopping is an essential and routine activity. Although long regarded the responsibility of the female spouse, modern social and demographic shifts are causing men to become more engaged in this task. This is the first paper to analyse gender differences with respect to the criterion of grocery product price within an Australian supermarket retail environment. A stratified sample of 140 male and 140 female grocery shoppers was surveyed. Results showed that men considered price attributes of products as being significantly lower in importance than did women. Additionally, men displayed lower levels of price involvement, reported referencing shelf price to a lesser extent, and gave lesser consideration to promotional tactics focusing on low price. Although men on average buy fewer items than do women, they spend more money for each item they purchase. This higher expenditure per item appears to be driven, at least in part, by a lack of price referencing. This research has implications for gender studies and consumer behaviour disciplines in relation to grocery shopping.

Keywords: Price; Gender; Supermarket Retailing; Consumer Behaviour, Australia.

Grocery Product Pricing and Australian Supermarket Consumers: Gender Differences in Perceived Importance Levels

Introduction

Gender differences in the context of grocery shopping is a rich topic for the popular media, yet this subject has only recently become an area of academic interest (Iacobucci and Ostrom 1993; Mazumdar and Papatla 1995; Dholakia 1999; Gardner 2004; Richbell and Kite 2007; Raajpoot, Sharma and Chebat 2008; Beynon, Moutinho and Veloutsou 2010; Helgesen and Nesset 2010). Research on Australian supermarket shopping behaviour has examined issues including list usage, store characteristics, promotional pricing and satisfaction levels, yet has neglected to consider the effects of gender (Miranda, Konya and Havrila 2005; Jones, Vilches-Montero, Spence, Eroglu and Machleit 2010). It is contended by many researchers, that recent social and demographic movements are causing changes to traditional gender roles within the household, with implications for things like grocery shopping (Piper and Capella 1993; Fischer and Arnold 1994; Dholakia, Pedersen and Hikmet 1995; Underhill 1999; Murcott 2000; Bhatti and Srivastava 2003).

Women now have access to improved levels of income and employment outside the home (Biernat and Wortman 1991; Harris and Firestone 1998; Murcott 2000). As a result, more men are either voluntarily or by necessity engaging in supermarket shopping because increasing numbers of women are progressing their career and have limited time to engage in household purchasing (Davis and Bell 1991; Dholakia, Pedersen et al. 1995; Mazumdar and Papatla 1995; Dholakia 1999; Gardner 2004; Richbell and Kite 2007). Men now play a major role in household shopping activity (Harmon and Hill 2003). Further, it has been recognised in studies of the role of price

and behaviour, that future research needs to reflect this trend, by using more heterogeneous samples, rather than those that are predominately female (Kukar-Kinney, Ridgway and Monroe 2011). It is argued that with considerable growth in the representation of male grocery shoppers, retail executives require a greater understanding of this group's shopping behaviour, particularly as compared to the traditional female grocery shopper.

The purpose of the present study is to examine differences between male and female grocery shoppers in the Australian grocery shopping context. The study's contribution is twofold. It acknowledges that men and women are socialised differently and presents an argument that these differences play an important role in the retail context, influencing perceptions of the importance of price, and hence shopping behaviour. It provides the first steps towards a greater understanding of the behaviours of the emergent male grocery shopper. In addition, it offers supermarket retailers insights to their customers' shopping habits. This research, we expect, may encourage supermarkets to review their current marketing, advertising, and promotional efforts to attract a greater proportion of customers.

This study examines male and female shoppers in the supermarket retail context, specifically in relation to differences in the perceived importance of price, price-related behaviours, and price-related outcomes. The following research question has been developed to address the above objectives.

> *Is there a difference between men and women with regard to the way price information is considered, and how does this affect price-related grocery shopping behaviour?*

Literature Review

Previous Work

There has been a lack of research investigating consumer choice behaviour in the context of Australian supermarket shopping. One study has examined grocery shopper satisfaction levels and included the variable of price, but did not examine the effect of gender (Miranda, Konya *et al.* 2005). The effect of promotional pricing on consumer spending and pack-size cannibalism has been examined (Dawes 2005; Dawes 2009; Dawes, Keynes, Lockshin and Murphy 2009), yet gender was again not considered. Price knowledge has been covered in the context of supermarket retailing (Zeithaml 1988; Dickson and Sawyer 1990; Urbany, Dickson and Kalapurakal 1996; Putrevu and Ratchford 1997; Vanhuele and Dreze 2002). Research suggests men consider the criterion of price as less important than do women (Zeithaml 1988; Williams 2002). Men have revealed a lower emphasis on economising techniques, such as searching for special prices, coupons and discounts (Zeithaml 1985; Polegato and Zaichkowsky 1994). The current research extends these prior contributions by examining gender differences in relation to the way price information is considered, and how this influences shopping behaviour in supermarket retailing in Australia.

Supermarket Shopping and Gender

Davies and Bell (1991) presented one of the earliest examinations of differences in male and female shopping behaviours in the supermarket context. Their study concluded that men's expenditure was higher per minute than women's, which coincided with the view that men rarely compare prices (Mazumdar and Papatla 1995; Underhill 1999). Polegato and Zaichkowsky (1994) examined task management

strategies adopted by men and women in the supermarket, and identified that men did not compare prices or stick to a defined budget. Women, on the other hand, were more inclined to shop around for the best buy and compare prices.

Mazumdar and Papatla (1995) endeavoured to explore gender differences in supermarket shopping and considered the constructs of price and promotion. They concluded that men in general, were price insensitive and less inclined to reference shelf label prices (Mazumdar and Papatla 1995; Reid and Brown 1996). Men have been found to search deliberately, limit price-comparison shopping and browse infrequently (Otnes and McGrath 2001; Thomas and Garland 2004). A study by Williams (2002) examined the constructs of decision-making by men and women in the supermarket, and found that men placed lesser importance than women on product evaluative criteria, like price. Yet, these studies have not explained why men were spending more at the supermarket compared to women. The current research will examine differences in perceptions of price importance, and the relationship between price referencing and spend per item at the supermarket as a possible explanation for these findings.

Involvement and Price

A substantial body of research surrounding the concept of involvement in routine food shopping exists (Deshpande, Hoyer and Jeffries 1982; Zaichkowsky 1985; Hoyer and Brown 1990; Leong 1993; Beharrell and Denison 1995; Arnould, Price and Zinkhan 2004; Wood 2005). It has been suggested that shoppers will vary the extensiveness of their decision-making processes and information search in terms of the number of choice criteria employed, based on the importance of the decision. It is posited that

this variation is dependent on the shopper's level of involvement (Park and Mittal 1985). The repetitive, routine purchasing nature of grocery products lends itself to the description of low involvement (Beharrell and Denison 1995). Low involvement shoppers are not active information seekers, hence may limited their choice decisions to only a few product attributes, such as price, quality, promotional discounts or brand (Hoyer and Brown 1990; Arnould, Price *et al.* 2004).

Price can be considered both objectively and subjectively by shoppers (Dickson and MacLachlan 1990). Studies have found that the objective price, when printed on a shelf label, is a key determinant affecting choice of product (Gatewood and Perloff 1973; Miyazaki, Sprott and Manning 2000). It is contended that an individual's price consciousness is an enduring motivator to consider price information. We proffer that individual differences exist between male and female grocery shoppers based on the level of price consciousness and accordingly, the extent to which they will refer to price when shopping for groceries. For the purposes of this research, price is considered as the printed visual medium on the shelf ticket.

It has been suggested that male shoppers consider qualitative product attributes as being less important than do female shoppers (Dholakia, Pedersen *et al.* 1995; Otnes and McGrath 2001). Similarly, the criterion of price is reported to be considered less important by male shoppers than by female shoppers (Mazumdar and Papatla 1995; Williams 2002). Some researchers have forwarded that men and women view products differently and may be expected to exhibit different patterns of responses relative to evaluative criteria importance (Fontenelle and Zinkhan 1993; Williams 2002). It has also been posited that traditionally, women have tended to be more

concerned and involved in the grocery shopping activity and have higher levels of price awareness (Mazumdar and Papatla 1995; Cleveland, Babin, Laroche, Ward and Bergeron 2003). When presented with several product choice attributes, we anticipate that self-reported importance ratings will be lower for men than for women, and that this will be the case for both price and non-price related attributes. Accordingly, it is hypothesised;

H1a. *Men will consider the criterion of price as less important than will women.*

H1b. *Men will consider criteria which are non-price related as less important than will women.*

It has been reported that men demonstrate a tendency toward instrumental, purely purchase driven shopping behaviour (Campbell 1997; Beynon, Moutinho et al. 2010). That is, men do not considered shopping to be a social or recreational activity and as a result are less involved in the activity (Bellenger and Pradeep 1980). It is therefore posited that men are overall less interested in the criterion of price and will limit comparison shopping when making a product selection in the supermarket. In relation to price involvement, it is hypothesised:

H2a. *Men are less involved in decisions of price than are women.*

Because of this lesser price involvement, and in line with the work of Mazumdar and Papatla (1995), we suggest that men will refer to shelf price less frequently than women while selecting grocery products. Some research has found that usage of supermarket price information and the extent of price referencing is low in general,

without examining gender differences (Dickson and Sawyer 1990). Others have found no significant statistical differences across genders based on in-store shelf price referencing (Mazumdar and Papatla 1995). Such is the ambiguity surrounding the extent of price checking at the supermarket, the following hypothesis is developed for testing in the current study:

H2b. *Shelf price is referenced less frequently by men than women.*

Lesser price referencing behaviour may also be reflected in lesser concern for 'low price' promotional offers. Consistently low product pricing tactics may not be considered by men to be an important factor when choosing a product or supermarket. In fact, it has been claimed that men have an intrinsic preference for higher priced brands (Mazumdar and Papatla 1995). Mazumdar and Papatla (1995) have suggested that men are disinterested shoppers, who are easily influenced by brands, rather than price. In contrast however, some researchers have found that men rate low price as an important criterion (Donegan 1986; Williams 2002). This paper will seek to clarify this issue, hypothesising that:

H2c. *The criterion 'low price' is considered less important by men than women.*

It is expected that because men are disinterested shoppers (Mazumdar and Papatla, 1995), they will tend to buy fewer items than will women. In addition, past research has found through examining supermarket purchase receipts, that male shoppers tend to spend more money per item than female shoppers (Zeithaml 1988; Davis and Bell 1991; Mazumdar and Papatla 1995), and that this extends beyond just grocery

shopping (Fischer and Arnold 1994). Reasons for this have been attributed to poor planning, non-list usage and limited price checking. Accordingly, it is expected:

H3a. *Men will buy fewer items than will women.*

H3b. *Men will spend more money per item than will women.*

It is our contention that a lack of price referencing in men is primarily responsible for this higher spend per item, and that if price referencing is controlled, men and women will show similar spend per item. Controlling for price referencing however, should have little impact on number of items purchased. Thus, it is hypothesised:

H4a. *Even when the influence of price referencing is controlled, men will buy fewer items than will women.*

H4b. *When the influence of price referencing is controlled, men will show a similar level of spend per item as women.*

Method

A cross sectional, micro-level study was employed. The data collection tool was a face-to-face questionnaire administered by a single researcher, and took approximately eight minutes to complete.

Sampling and Procedures

A stratified probability sampling method was used to ensure a representative sample of 140 male and 140 female grocery shoppers. Previous samples for grocery shopping surveys have included between 70 and 120 respondents (e.g., Hoyer 1984, Leong

1993, Thomas and Garland 2004) and have also used an equal gender split (Davis and Bell 1991, Piron 2002). The sample was drawn from Brisbane, Australia, which is a major state capital. Data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (www.abs.gov.au) aided the selection of two significantly different socio-economic areas across four suburbs (two lower and two higher socio-economic areas). One supermarket from each of the two market leaders in Australia (representing between 70–72% of the market) were the sampling locations (IBIS World Industry Report 2006). One supermarket from each chain was chosen for each socio-economic area.

The definition of a grocery shopper used in this study is a person who enters a supermarket with a basket or trolley to make a purchase and is not a supermarket employee, supplier or manager. The study recruited male and female grocery shoppers who indicated that they were primarily or equally responsible for undertaking the weekly grocery-shopping task. All individual men and women observed entering one of the nominated supermarkets during the data collection period were potential respondents. In an effort to reduce sampling bias, every fifth shopper was approached to participate in the study and the researcher moved to the next supermarket on fulfilment of a quota of 35 male and 35 female shoppers from each of the supermarkets. Data from men or women shopping as part of a couple were not collected, in order to avoid possible response bias. Minors (under 18 years) were also outside the sampling specifications.

Instrument

A questionnaire was constructed and pilot tested using 25 male and 25 female undergraduate students with grocery shopping experience. The initial part of the

instrument informed respondents of the nature of the study, the proposed use of data, and of confidentiality and privacy considerations. Table 1 shows the scale items employed in the questionnaire, their item means, construct means, and alpha coefficients.

To test price and non-price product attribute importance (H1a and H1b), ten scale items measured using 5-point Likert-type scales (anchored at 1-*strongly disagree* and 5-*strongly agree*) were employed. These were adapted from previous academic studies of supermarket product evaluation (Lichtenstein, Ridgeway and Netemeyer 1993; Smith and Carsky 1996; Williams 2002). Three of the scale items relate to price attribute importance, and seven to non-price attribute importance. To test price involvement (H2a), the scale items used were those developed by Lichtenstein, Ridgway and Netemeyer (1993) in their test of grocery shopping responsibility in households. Responses were again made on 5-point Likert-type scales (anchored at 1-*strongly disagree* and 5-*strongly agree*), with four items negatively phrased. To test price referencing (H2b), three 5-point scale items (anchored at 1-*strongly disagree* and 5-*strongly agree*) were employed. These followed the multi-item measurement scale employed by Putrevu and Ratchford's (1997) study of grocery shoppers' price comparison behaviour. To test responses to the criterion of 'low price' (H2c) three 5-point Likert-type scales (anchored at 1-*very unimportant* and 5-*very important*) were developed, based on the work of Polegato and Zaichkowsky (1994).

Number of items purchased (H3a and H4a) was determined following the method used by Davis and Bell (1991). Respondents were asked to produce their shopping receipt, and the number of listed items was recorded. Spend per item (H3b and H4b)

was calculated by dividing the total number of items listed by the total amount spent. If respondents failed to produce a receipt, they were excluded from the sample.

Analysis and Results

Prior to analysis, negatively worded scale items were reversed, so that across all items, higher values were associated with higher levels of the attribute being measured. Construct values were determined by taking the mean of the associated scales items. The set of scale items for each construct produced high alpha coefficients, indicating these were well correlated and reliably tapping the same construct (see Table 1).

INSERT: **Table 1: Scale Items, Means, Construct Means and Coefficient Alphas**

To test the hypotheses that men will consider both price (H1a) and non-price (H1b) attributes as having lower importance than will women, a 2 x 2 mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Gender was a between subjects independent variable and attribute type was a within subjects independent variable, while the importance rating was the dependent variable. Results showed a main effect of gender, $F(1, 278) = 586.63$, $p<.001$, indicating that overall, men gave lower importance ratings than women (*M*s=3.66 and 4.63 respectively). There was a main effect of attribute type, $F(1, 278) = 482.06$, $p<.001$ indicating that price attributes were rated higher overall than non-price attributes (*M*s=4.45 and 3.83 respectively). An interaction between gender and attribute type, $F(1, 278) = 16.82$, $p<.001$ showed that the difference between men and women for price attributes (*M*s=4.03 and 4.88 respectively) was smaller than the difference between men and women for non-price

attributes (*M*s=3.30 and 4.37 respectively). Although this might be interpreted as men and women being more similar on price attributes than non-price attributes, it is probably largely due to women's ratings of price attributes being at near ceiling levels.

A multivariate ANOVA was used to investigate gender differences in terms of price involvement (H2a), price referencing (H2b), and consideration given to the criterion of 'low price' (H2c). Gender was the independent variable, while each of the mentioned constructs served as dependent variables. Using Pillai's Trace as the multivariate test statistic, gender was shown to relate significantly to the dependent variables, $F(3, 276) = 210.26$, $p<.001$. Univariate results showed that men rated price involvement significantly lower than did women (*M*s=1.73 and 4.20 respectively), $F(1, 278) = 550.98$, $p<.001$, that men reported price referencing to a lesser extent than did women (*M*s=3.49 and 4.76 respectively), $F(1, 278) = 229.85$, $p<.001$, and that men indicated they paid less attention to the criterion of 'low price' than did women (*M*s=3.96 and 4.80 respectively), $F(1, 278) = 254.78$, $p<.001$.

A second multivariate ANOVA was conducted, again using gender as the independent variable, but with number of items purchased (H3a) and spend per item (H3b) as dependent variables. Here Pillai's Trace was significant at the multivariate level, $F(2, 277) = 21.01$, $p<.001$. At the univariate level, as hypothesised, it was shown that men purchased significantly fewer items than did women, (*M*s=22.10 and 38.81 respectively), $F(1, 278) = 39.03$, $p<.001$, but spent significantly more per each item, (*M*s=$4.17 and $3.29 respectively), $F(1, 278) = 5.12$, $p=.024$. When this analysis was re-run with price referencing added as a covariate (H4a and H4b), Pillai's Trace

remained significant, $F(2, 276) = 3.22$, $p=.041$. At the univariate level, the difference in number of items purchased also remained significant, (*M*s=26.25 and 34.66 respectively), $F(1, 277) = 5.64$, $p=.018$, however, the difference in spend per item between men and women became non-significant, (*M*s=$4.01 and $3.44 respectively), $F(1, 277) = 1.17$, $p=.280$. This suggests that part of the reason men may be spending more per item is due to a lack of price checking. Failure to check prices however, has little to do with buying fewer items (as would be expected).

Discussion

These results extend earlier research into supermarket shopping behaviour in three ways. Firstly, they show differences between men and women grocery shoppers in terms of the rated importance of the criterion of price. Secondly they show that there are gender differences in terms of reported behaviours such as shelf price referencing. Thirdly, the results show that reported behavioural differences in price referencing affect outcomes like spend per item. Previous studies of Australian supermarket shopper behaviour have not considered the effect of gender in relation to perceptions of price importance together with its influence on behaviours like price checking and spend per item. This research therefore offers an important contribution.

While our results show that product price attributes were considered more important by both men and women than non-price attributes, men rated price as being of significantly lesser importance than did women. It is likely that male grocery shoppers are less willing to take the time to check prices or search for cheaper priced items (or perhaps shop at different supermarkets to save money) because they are not as price involved or interested in the shopping experience as women. Our findings

are based on the Australian supermarket context, but are in line with earlier work reported outside the Australian context (Dholakia, Pedersen *et al.* 1995). It is possible that as more men take on the role of the weekly grocery shopper that they will begin to place more importance on price, and to be more price involved, however, currently this is not the case.

As well as having low levels of price involvement, this research also confirms men give lesser consideration to low price promotional tactics. It is contended that as a result of this, men take less time referencing shelf prices and searching for lower prices. This may lead to faster shopping times, however it also appears to lead to higher prices being paid for products at the register. Our results show that on average men purchase fewer items than women, presumably because they are less involved in the shopping experience, but that they spent more for each item purchased. When controlling for the influence of lack of price referencing, men's higher expenditure per item disappears. This seems to indicate that men are spending more per item because they are not checking prices. Men nonetheless still purchase fewer items than women, even when price referencing is controlled.

Conclusion

It is not suggested in this paper that men are price insensitive shoppers or do not consider price as important. Instead what is being suggested is that men do not display these qualities to the same extent as women. Men are a growing group of consumers in Australian supermarkets, and therefore shopping related issues will be important to this group (Nielsen 2010). Our results show that male shoppers do

consider the criterion of price to be important and more important than other non-price criteria, but that these importance ratings are significantly lower than those of women (who rate price at near ceiling levels). The only construct on which men do appear to display an opposite trend to women is price involvement. With price involvement, women displayed an average mean equivalent to a rating of *agree* (4.20) while men displayed an average mean equivalent to a rating of *disagree* (1.73).

Although retail trade conditions differ globally, the Australian food retailing sector has demonstrated slow growth and increased competition over the past few years (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). Food retailing sales decreased (-0.4%) during the January to March 2011 quarter. Sluggish growth and increased competition in food retailing has increased the need for retailers to adopt strategies designed to not only attract but also retain customers. This study has argued that the emergent cohort of male grocery shoppers do not consider price as important as do female shoppers, and as such, traditional temporary price reduction and promotional price campaigns may be poorly targeted towards men. Hence, non-price conscious males may be an attractive segment for supermarket executives to consider.

Supermarket retailers need to evaluate more sustainable marketing strategies that are not framed by price. If a substantial segment of men are now making household purchase decisions, temporary price promotions that have traditionally been used to reach the female shopper may not be as effective with the male shopper (Harmon and Hill 2003). Clearly, the results of this study suggest male grocery shoppers are not exceedingly concerned with price. Loyalty cards appeared in one study to be the promotion vehicle used by a majority of men (Harmon and Hill 2003), and

accordingly retailers may find value in linking promotional efforts to loyalty card programs. Lifestyle marketing appeals, promoting family meal time, cooking and gourmet food, may be a further avenue for retailers to explore. Such campaigns shift the focus away from price, and may be a way of appealing to men. These types of campaigns may also lead to greater positive reinforcement for men from other family members, if it encourages them to be even more involved in shopping and cooking (Dholakia, 1999).

Male shoppers purchase fewer items than female shoppers and consider non-price choice criteria, like brand, quality and freshness as being of lesser importance than price. It is suggested wide product ranges and variety are not as important considerations for men. One recommendation would be for supermarket executives to review current ranges and tiers of product groups and rationalise accordingly. Male grocery shoppers may be more likely to patronise supermarkets that offer a simplified, core range of tiered products, as opposed to a complex array of choice.

Because these data were collected in one Australian state capital, Brisbane, future research could be extended to include other cities, including those with larger ethnic presences, to determine the generality of the findings. A cross-cultural comparative study may also reveal interesting findings. Our sampling procedure and the degree of randomness of participant recruitment was also limited, as described, and may not have provided a full probabilistic sample. The sampling frame included only respondents shopping at the two major Australian supermarket retailers, hence responses from shoppers who chose to patronise smaller, local independent grocery retailers were not necessarily incorporated. It is recognised that shoppers who do

choose to shop with smaller independents may value locality and convenience over price. Future research should consider these enterprises.

It is fundamental for marketers to consider not only the similarities of men and women shoppers, but also their differences with regard to things like shopping behaviour. This study goes some way to identify differences between these two types of shopper in relation to the criterion of price. For marketers, these differences suggest the need for creative strategies to target a growing and often overlooked cohort of male shoppers. We anticipate that the shopping routines of fathers will continue to influence young boys, as men assume a more active role in household shopping activities, and that male shoppers will become an increasingly important segment.

REFERENCE LIST

Arnould, E. J., L. L. Price and G. M. Zinkhan (2004). Consumers. Boston, McGraw Hill Irwin.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2011). "Retail Trade - Food Retailing, Supermarkets and Grocery Stores - 8501.0"

Beharrell, B. and T. J. Denison (1995). "Involvement in a Routine Food Shopping Context." British Food Journal **97**(4): pp. 24-29.

Bellenger, D. N. and K. Pradeep (1980). "Profiling the Recreational Shopper." Journal of Consumer Research **66**(Winter): pp. 77-92.

Beynon, M. J., L. A. Moutinho and C. Veloutsou (2010). "Gender Differences in Supermarket Choice." European Journal of Marketing **44**(1): pp.267-290.

Bhatti, S. and R. Srivastava (2003). "Participation of Working Women in Decision Making Process as Consumer." International Journal of Consumer Studies **27**(3): pp. 218-251.

Biernat, M. and C. B. Wortman (1991). "Sharing of Home Responsibilities between Professionally Employed Women and their Husbands." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **60**(6): pp. 844-860.

Campbell, C. (1997). Shopping, Pleasure and the Sex War. The Shopping Experience. P. Falk and C. Campbell. London, Sage Publications.

Cleveland, M., B. J. Babin, M. Laroche, P. Ward and J. Bergeron (2003). "Information Search Patterns for Gift Purchases: A Cross National Examination of Gender Differences." Journal of Consumer Behaviour **3**(September): pp. 20-47.

Coakes, S. J., Steed, L., Dzidic, P. (2006). SPSS Version 13: Analysis without the Anguish. Sydney, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Davis, G. and J. Bell (1991). "The Grocery Shopper - Is He Different?" International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management **19**(1): pp. 25-28.

Dawes, J. (2005). "The Effect of Service Price Increases on Customer Retention: The Moderating Role of Customer Tenure and Relationship Breadth." Journal of Service Research **11**(3): pp. 232-245.

Dawes, J. (2009). Brand Pack Size Cannibalization Arising from Temporary Price Promotions- An Examination of Two FMCG Markets. ANZMAC 2009, Melbourne.

Dawes, J., W. Keynes, L. Lockshin and T. Murphy (2009). A Coherent Pattern in Consumer Purchase Across Price Tiers: Australian Wine. ANZMAC 2009, Melbourne.

Deshpande, R., W. D. Hoyer and S. Jeffries (1982). Low Involvement Decision Processes: The Importance of Choice Tactics. Chicago, American Marketing Association.

Dholakia, R. R. (1999). "Going Shopping: Key Determinants of Shopping Behaviours and Motivations." International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management **27**(4): pp. 154-165.

Dholakia, R. R., B. Pedersen and N. Hikmet (1995). "Married Males and Shopping: Are they Sleeping Partners?" International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management **3**(23): pp. 27-33.

Dickson, J. P. and D. L. MacLachlan (1990). "Social Distance and Shopping Behaviour." Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science **18**(Spring): pp. 224-234.

Dickson, P. R. and A. G. Sawyer (1990). "Price Knowledge and the Search of Supermarket Shoppers." Journal of Marketing **54**(July): pp. 42-53.

Donegan, P. (1986). "The Myth of the Male Shopper." Progressive Grocer **May**: pp. 36-42.

Fischer, E. and S. J. Arnold (1994). "Sex, Gender Identity, Gender Role Attitudes and Consumer Behaviour." Psychology and Marketing **8**(2): pp. 163-182.

Fontenelle, S. and G. M. Zinkhan (1993). "Gender Differences in the Perception of Leisure: A Conceptual Model." Advances in Consumer Research **20**: pp. 534-540.

Gardner, M. (2004). "What Men Want - In the Supermarket." The Christian Science Monitor **23**(1): pp. 11-15.

Gatewood, R. D. and R. Perloff (1973). "An Experimental Investigation of Three Methods of Providing Weight and Price Information to Consumers." Journal of Applied Psychology **57**(February): pp. 81-85.

Harmon, S. K. and C. J. Hill (2003). "Gender and Coupon Use." Journal of Product and Brand Management **12**(3): pp. 166-179.

Harris, R. J. and J. M. Firestone (1998). "Changes in Predictors of Gender Role Ideologies among Women: A Multivariate Analysis." Journal of Behavioural Sciences **2**(1): pp. 15-23.

Helgesen, O. and E. Nesset (2010). "Gender, Store Satisfaction and Antecedents: A case Study of a Grocery Store." Journal of Consumer Marketing **27**(2): pp. 114-126.

Hoyer, W. D. and S. P. Brown (1990). "Effects of Brand Awareness on Choice for a Common, Repeat-Purchase Product." Journal of Consumer Research **17**(2): pp. 141-149.

Hu, D., Reardon, T., Rozelle, S., Timmer, P. & Wong, H. (2004). "The Emergence of Supermarkets with Chinese Characteristics: Challenges and Opportunities for China's Agriculture Development." Development Policy Review **22**(5): pp. 557-586.

Iacobucci, D. and A. Ostrom (1993). "Gender Differences in the Impact of Core and Relational Aspects of Services on the Evaluation of Service Encounters." Journal of Consumer Psychology **2**(3): pp. 257-287.

Jones, M. Y., S. Vilches-Montero, M. T. Spence, S. E. Eroglu and K. A. Machleit (2010). "Do Australian and American Consumers Differ in their Perceived Shopping Experiences? A Bi-cultural Analysis." International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management **38**(8): pp. 578-596.

Kukar-Kinney, M., N. M. Ridgway and K. B. Monroe (2011). "The Role of Price in the Behavior and Purchase Decisions of Compulsive Buyers." Journal of Retailing **xxx**(xxx): pp xxx-xxx.

Leong, S. W. (1993). "Consumer Decision Making for Common, Repeat-Purchase Products: A Dual Replication." Journal of Consumer Psychology **2**(2): pp. 193-208.

Lichtenstein, D. R., N. M. Ridgeway and R. D. Netemeyer (1993). "Price Perceptions and Consumer Shopping Behaviour: A Field Study." Journal of Marketing Research **30**(May): pp. 234-45.

Mazumdar, T. and P. Papatla (1995). "Effects of Shopping Basket Size on Price and Promotion Responses." Pricing Strategy and Practice **3**(3): pp. 16-24.

Mazumdar, T. and P. Papatla (1995). "Gender Difference in Price and Promotion Response." Pricing Strategy and Practice **3**(1): pp. 21-34.

Miranda, M. J., L. Konya and I. Havrila (2005). "Shoppers' Satisfaction Levels are not the only Key to Store Loyalty." Marketing Intelligence and Planning **23**(2): pp. 220-232.

Miyazaki, A. D., D. E. Sprott and K. C. Manning (2000). "Unit Prices on Retail Shelf Labels: An Assessment of Information Prominence." Journal of Retailing **76**(1): pp. 93-112.

Murcott, A. (2000). "Invited Presentation: Is It Still a Pleasure to Cook for Him? Social Changes in the Household and the Family." Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics **24**(2): pp. 78-84.

Nielsen (2010). Nielsen Shopper Trends 2010. Melbourne, AC Nielsens.

Otnes, C. and M. A. McGrath (2001). "Perceptions and Realities of Male Shopping Behaviour." Journal of Retailing **77**(1): pp. 111-137.

Pallant, J. (2007). SPSS Survival Manual. Crowsnest, NSW, Allen & Unwin.

Park, C. W. and B. Mittal (1985). A Theory of Involvement in Consumer Behaviour: Problems and Issues. Research in Consumer Behaviour. J. N. Sheth. Greenwich, JAI Press. **1:** pp. 201-232.

Piper, W. S. and L. M. Capella (1993). "Male Grocery Shoppers Attitudes and Demographics." International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management **21**(5): pp. 22-30.

Piron, F. (2002). "Singaporean Husbands and Grocery Shopping: An Investigation into Claims of Changing Spousal Influence." Singapore Management Review **24** (1): pp.51-66.

Polegato, R. and J. L. Zaichkowsky (1994). "Family Food Shopping: Strategies used by Husbands and Wives." Journal of Consumer Affairs **28**(2): pp. 278-300.

Putrevu, S. and B. T. Ratchford (1997). "A Model of Search Behaviour and an Application to Grocery Shopping." Journal of Consumer Research **73**(4): pp. 463-486.

Raajpoot, N. A., A. Sharma and J. C. Chebat (2008). "The Role of Gender and Work Status in Shopping Center Patronage." Journal of Business Research **61**(2): pp. 825-833.

Reardon, T., Timmer, P. & Berdegue, J. A. (2004). "The Rapid Rise of Supermarkets in Developing Countries: Induced Organizational, Institutional and Technological

Change in Agrifood Systems." Electronic Journal of Agriculture and Dvelopment conomics **1**(2): pp. 168-183.

Reid, R. and S. Brown (1996). "I Hate Shopping! An Introspective Perspective." International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management **24**(4): pp. 4-16.

Richbell, S. and V. Kite (2007). "Night Shoppers in the "Open 24 hours" Supermarket: A Profile." International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management **35**(1): pp. 54-68.

Seth, A. and G. Randall (2001). The Grocers: The Rise and Rise of the Supermarket Chains, Kogan Page.

Smith, M. F. and M. L. Carsky (1996). "Grocery Shopping Behaviour: A Comparison of Involved and Uninvolved Consumers." Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services **3**(2): pp. 73-80.

Thomas, A. and R. Garland (2004). "Grocery Shopping: List and Non-List Usage." Marketing Intelligence and Planning **22**(6): pp. 623-635.

Traill, B. W. (2006). "The Rapid Rise of Supermarkets." Development Policy Review **24**(2): pp. 163-174.

Underhill, P. (1999). Why We Buy: The Science of Shopping. New York, Simon & Schuster.

Urbany, J. E., P. E. Dickson and R. Kalapurakal (1996). "Price Search in the Retail Grocery Market." Journal of Marketing **60**(4): pp. 91-104.

Vanhuele, M. and X. Dreze (2002). "Measuring the Price Knowledge Shoppers bring to the Store." Journal of Marketing **66**(4): pp. 72-86.

Williams, T. G. (2002). "Social Class Influence on Purchase Evaluation Criteria." The Journal of Consumer Marketing **19**(3): pp. 249-277.

Wood, M. (2005). "Discretionary Unplanned Buying in Consumer Society." Journal of Consumer Behaviour **4**(4): pp. 268-282.

Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1985). "Measuring the Involvement Construct." Journal of Consumer Research **12**(December): pp. 341-352.

Zeithaml, V. A. (1985). "The New Demographics and Market Fragmentation." Journal of Marketing **49**(3): pp. 64-75.

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). "Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality and Value: A Means-End Model and Synthesis of Evidence." Journal of Marketing **52**(3): pp. 2-22.

Table 1: Scale Items, Means, Construct Means and Coefficient Alphas

Scale Item	Full Item Mean (standard deviation)		Male Item Mean (standard deviation)		Female Item Mean (standard deviation)		Full Construct Mean (standard deviation)		Male Construct Mean (standard deviation)		Female Construct Mean (standard deviation)		Full Alpha Coefficient	Male Alpha Coefficient	Female Alpha Coefficient
Price Attribute Importance							**4.45**	0.552	**4.03**	0.426	**4.88**	0.263	0.882	0.730	0.718
Price *is important to me when I am selecting products at*	**4.58**	0.537	**4.24**	0.517	**4.91**	0.280									
Value for money *is important to me when I am selecting*	**4.38**	0.660	**3.91**	0.548	**4.84**	0.365									
The amount of ***special discount*** *is important to me when I*	**4.41**	0.638	**3.94**	0.520	**4.87**	0.336									
Non-Price Attribute Importance							**3.83**	0.706	**3.30**	0.564	**4.37**	0.309	0.931	0.878	0.713
Brand *is important to me when I am selecting products at*	**4.05**	0.880	**3.61**	0.910	**4.49**	0.581									
Nutritional information *is important to me when I am*	**3.65**	0.892	**3.04**	0.785	**4.25**	0.496									
Ingredients *are important to me when I am selecting*	**3.45**	0.934	**2.79**	0.794	**4.11**	4.900									
Freshness *is important to me when I am selecting products*	**4.15**	0.709	**3.72**	0.612	**4.59**	0.509									
Taste *is important to me when I am selecting products at*	**3.65**	0.868	**3.06**	0.761	**4.23**	0.500									
Quality *is important to me when I am selecting products at*	**4.17**	0.716	**3.71**	0.603	**4.62**	0.501									
It is important to me, when I am selecting products at the	**3.73**	0.846	**3.12**	0.683	**4.33**	0.486									
Price Involvement							**2.97**	1.515	**1.73**	0.861	**4.20**	0.896	0.987	0.960	0.962
I am ***not*** *willing to go to extra effort to find lower prices.*	**3.07**	1.538	**1.86**	0.946	**4.27**	0.966									
I ***will*** *grocery shop at more than one store to take*	**3.06**	1.571	**1.81**	0.993	**4.31**	0.906									
The money saved by finding low prices is usually ***not*** *worth*	**2.93**	1.541	**1.71**	0.884	**4.14**	1.008									
I would ***never*** *shop at more than one store to find lower*	**2.89**	1.552	**1.62**	0.893	**4.11**	0.953									
The time it takes to find lower prices is usually ***not*** *worth*	**2.90**	1.567	**1.65**	0.913	**4.15**	0.974									
Price Referencing							**4.12**	0.943	**3.49**	0.912	**4.76**	0.381	0.975	0.973	0.846
I read the price tags of the grocery products I buy.	**4.16**	0.926	**3.56**	0.892	**4.76**	0.447									
Before buying a product, I check the price.	**4.13**	9.830	**3.49**	0.963	**4.77**	0.420									
I check the prices of the grocery products that I purchase.	**4.09**	0.991	**3.43**	0.953	**4.74**	0.439									
Low Price							**4.38**	0.605	**3.95**	0.482	**4.80**	0.388	0.976	0.952	0.958
Low prices everyday.	**4.36**	0.607	**3.95**	0.470	**4.78**	0.417									
Consistent pricing .	**4.39**	0.624	**3.97**	0.522	**4.81**	0.396									
Competitive prices.	**4.38**	0.628	**3.96**	0.521	**4.80**	0.401									
*note that displayed means are after reversal of the item scoring															